REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application.

Claims 4, 6, 8, 14-15, and 23 have been canceled.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 13, 16, 20-22, and 24 have been amended, as more particularly described below.

Claims 25 and 26 are new and claim different patterns in which the array of LEDs can be arranged. In light of Applicant's responses to the novelty and obviousness rejections (see below), Applicant believes Claims 25 and 26 are also in allowable form.

The Examiner has objected to the Specification, paragraph 21, lines 19-20, as not sufficient to support Claim 7. Claim 7 has been amended in a manner that renders this objection moot.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 7 and 13. Both of these claims have been amended in a manner that renders these objections moot.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 5, 7, 12-13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 4, 5, 7, 13, and 20 have been amended in a manner that renders these rejections as moot. With regard to Claim 12, the "fixture" and "component of a fixture" is illustrated in Fig. 3 and identified

with the numeral 119. A fixture has an ordinary and plain meaning to one of ordinary skill in the lighting industry. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 2 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nolan (US Publication 2003/00721145). Claims 2 and 21 have both been amended. Amended claims 2 and 21 both teach obtaining a uniform distribution of light by utilizing an array of LEDs arranged in a pattern of rows and where the LEDs have an illumination angle of approximately fifty degrees or greater. Nolan does not contain such a teaching and, therefore, cannot qualify as an anticipatory reference. In addition, Nolan teaches the use of a diffusion panel (70). A diffusion panel disperses the light and spreads it about the illuminated area, (See Paragraph 0034 of Nolan). Nolan teaches the way to uniformly illuminate an illuminated area is to (non-uniformly) illuminate a diffusion panel disposed between the light source area and the area to be illuminated. Nolan, therefore, does not provide a prima facie case for a novelty rejection since Nolan fails to teach all of the limitations in the Applicant's claims; i.e., Nolan does not teach uniformly lighting a translucent panel FROM THE BACKSIDE BY THE ARRAY OF LEDs. Applicant, therefore, respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 2 and 21 based on Nolan and requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5-7, 9-10, 13, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nolan in view of McManigal. Claims 4 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Damadian in view of Nolan and McManigal. Claims 11-12 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Damadian in view of Nolan.

Claims 4, 6, and 23 have been canceled and, therefore, rejections with respect to these claims are rendered moot.

All of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections depend upon Nolan. As stated previously, Nolan does not teach the use of an array of LEDs having an illumination angle of approximately fifty degrees or greater arranged in a pattern of rows in order to obtain a uniform distribution of light, as do Applicant's amended independent Claims 2, 13, and 21. In addition, neither McManigal nor Damadian contains such teachings. A prima facie case for 35 U.S.C. § 103, therefore, does not exist for any of Applicant's claims since the cited references do not contain all of the limitations of the Applicant's independent claims. In view of these considerations, all other rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 are now moot.

Applicant believes the claims are now in allowable form and respectfully requests that all rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Moreover, Claim 3 as amended includes a limitation to DIRECTLY illuminating the translucent panel from the back side by the array of LEDs. Nolan cannot teach, suggest or provide any motivation to change the prior art to directly illuminate the backside of the translucent panel by the array because Nolan teaches away, in that it teaches the insertion of a diffuser 70 to disperse and spread out the light.

In addition, neither McManigal nor Damadian teaches the use of LEDs. One of ordinary skill in the art would, therefore, not be motivated to combine the teaching of Nolan with either McManigal or Damadian in order to create an array of LEDs having a uniform distribution light.

Lastly, claims 16 and 24 have been amended to include the limitation of DIRECTLY illuminating the backside of the translucent panel by the LED array. Nolan teaches away from DIRECT illumination by teaching the use of diffusion panel 70 inserted between the light source and the area to be illuminated, so as to disperse and spread out the light incident upon the illuminated area. No new matter is added by the inclusion of the additional limitation of DIRECTLY because this is clearly shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory G. Williams, Reg. No. 31,681
SIMMONS PERRINE PLC
Third Floor Tower Place
22 South Linn Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Telephone: (319) 887-1368
Facsimile: (319) 887-1372